

REMARKS

Claims 1-45 are pending in this application.

In the outstanding Official Action the examiner has rejected claims 1-3, 18-20, 33-35 and 45 under 35 USC 102(e) as anticipated by the Ozaki et al (USP 6672962), rejected claims 4-7, 17, 21-23, 26,32 and 36-39 under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Ozaki et al (USP 6672962) in view of Woolston (US6902482), rejected claims 8, 9, 24, 40-42 under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Ozaki et al (USP 6672962) in view of Rothchild (US2002/0171625), and rejected claims 10-14, 27, 28, 31, and 43 under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Ozaki et al (USP 6672962) in view of “VR Gun System Specifications”.

Examiner Williams is thanked for the courtesy of a personal interview on February 22, 2008. Due to the snowfall which occurred that day, Examiner Williams was not at the office at the time of our scheduled appointment, and the receptionist asked the undersigned if he would agree to have the interview with examiner Williams’ Supervisory Primary Examiner (SPE) Robert E. Pezzuto.

Attached is an Interview Summary signed by SPE Robert Pezzuto, indicating that if applicant added to the independent claims a motion sensor, and language which differentiated between the users actual and displayed point of view, the current prior art rejections would be overcome. Later that day, Examiner Williams became available, and an interview was had between the undersigned attorney and Examiner Williams, where Examiner Williams reviewed and agreed with the substance of the Interview Summary of SPE Pezzuto. More specifically, it was agreed that the “light gun” video game controller of the Ozaki cited prior art did NOT show or suggest the use of a “motion sensor” and it did NOT control the point of view of the user “in the video game virtual environment”. Thus, the addition of the suggested language to the independent claims should now make all of claims 1-45 allowable.

Also discussed, but not noted on the Interview Summary, was the undersigned's belief that the Final Rejection was inappropriate due to some dependent claims being Finally Rejected based on newly cited prior art, yet those claims were not amended by applicant in reply to the First Office Action.

During a telephone conversation with Examiner Williams on April 8, 2008, Examiner Williams stated that he did not agree that the Final Rejection was inappropriate, yet he did again agree that an amendment of applicants independent claims in accordance with what was stated in the Interview Summary dated February 22, 2008 would result in overcoming the outstanding Final Office Action, and recommended that an RCE application be filed with a submission which amended the claims in accordance with our prior agreement.

By this reply, each of the independent claims are amended in accordance with the substance of the Interview Summary, and therefore the 35 USC 102 and 103 rejections should now be overcome, and claims 1-45 should now be allowable.

If any issues remain, the office is asked to contact the Attorney noted below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Lawrence C. Edelman/

Lawrence C. Edelman, Reg. No. 29,299
3 Buffalo Run
East Brunswick, NJ 08816-4003
Office: 732 251-3809 Cell: 732 771-3775